

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 883

HE 030 101

AUTHOR Zemsky, Robert, Ed.
 TITLE Turning Point.
 INSTITUTION Institute for Research on Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.; Pew Higher Education Roundtable, Philadelphia, PA; Knight Foundation, Inc., Akron, Ohio.; Knight Collaborative, Akron, OH.
 PUB DATE May 97
 NOTE 13p.
 AVAILABLE FROM Policy Perspectives, Institute for Research on Higher Education, 4200 Pine Street, 5A, Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090.
 PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
 JOURNAL CIT Policy Perspectives; v7 n2 May 1997
 EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; Cooperative Planning; Educational Improvement; *Educational Innovation; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Institutional Evaluation; Institutional Research; Institutional Survival; *Interschool Communication; *Partnerships in Education; Planning; Quality Circles; Self Evaluation (Groups)
 IDENTIFIERS Knight Collaborative

ABSTRACT

This document summarizes roundtable discussions held in November 1996 to address the current condition of higher education, the process of change, and possible joint projects under the new Knight Collaborative group. The group defined the four fundamental steps believed necessary to create a framework for institutional change: (1) establishing a basis for trust, with administrative and faculty having joint responsibility for defining goals and priorities; (2) linking advocacy and reform by defining what the institution is, what it intends to do, and what its values are; (3) recasting institutional governance; and (4) controlling costs. To support this agenda, the Collaborative is establishing cooperative programs to design and implement models that call for executive education through leadership teams and by devising problem-solving strategies. These programs will deliver educational experiences by redesigning learning spaces, using time as the accounting unit of learning, integrating technology to create new modes of teaching and learning, educating the community, and sustaining a learning environment for increasingly mobile students. The programs plan to manage resources by using new strategies for fund raising, implementing distributed budgeting systems, and providing monetary and nonmonetary incentives to maintain faculty commitment to the institutional purpose. (CH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

May 1997

Volume 7

Number 2

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Institute of Research

on H.E., Univ of PA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

P-O-L-I-C-Y

PERSPECTIVES

Supported by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation
and The Pew Charitable Trusts

Turning Point



It was a gathering more concerned with the nimbleness of the enterprise than with its organizational neatness. We had brought together senior faculty and administrative leaders from 130 of the 142 colleges and universities that over the last three years had accepted our invitation "to dance with change." Part of the time was spent limbering up, preparing

education, about the process of change, and about the kinds of joint projects and ventures institutions might join in under the banner of the new Knight Collaborative. In this latter respect, Return to St. Louis was itself a turning point—the joining together under the joint auspices of The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation in pursuit of the agenda originally put forward by the Pew Higher Education Roundtable.

Mixed Messages

As often contradictory as they were purposeful, discussions in St. Louis reflected both a longing for more settled times and an edginess to get on with the business of change—a desire to pause and reflect, coupled with the desire to stop the talk and

for more complicated tasks that lay ahead. There were quick glances in the mirror the discussions provided, attempts, really, to gauge how far participants had come and how far they had yet to go. It was about strength and control, about pausing, if ever so briefly, to prepare for the next movement—about turning points and new equilibriums in a dance that now seems without end.

Not since the first meeting in St. Louis in November 1993 had we assembled so many people to participate in broad-based discussions of where the enterprise had been, where it was going, and the likely conditions it would encounter en route. In this Return to St. Louis we sought to learn from the faculty and administrative leaders of our Roundtable institutions what had changed over the past three years and what had remained the same. This issue of Policy Perspectives recounts the lessons of those discussions: what we have come to understand about the current condition of higher

What nearly every roundtable discovered was the gap between consensus for action and action itself. Conceptions differed about how much higher education institutions could or should be altered, and whether societal pressure in itself should be a sufficient reason to bring about those changes.

introspection that too often distracts more than it comforts. Nearly every institution and most participants reported that their campus roundtables had helped create a consensus for change largely by identifying the nature of the external forces leading to a fundamental reordering of institutional priori-

ties. What nearly every roundtable discovered as well was the gap between consensus for action and action itself. Not surprisingly, one of the outside observers invited to St. Louis thought the conversations indicated that the academy was an enterprise "still facing the fundamental issue" of whether different ways of doing business were really necessary. There was concern about the difficulty of convincing an institution to change when it does not appear to be confronting imminent crisis. Conceptions differed about how much higher education institutions could or should be altered, and whether societal pressure in itself should be a sufficient reason to bring about these changes.

Faculty voiced frustration at the amount of time they found themselves devoting to an institutional agenda for change, only to find their work consigned to a forgotten shelf. Even worse was the thought that their efforts had served principally to bolster an administrator's credentials for a career step to another institution. With each successive administration, the change imperative would take on a different voice as new leadership began the process from scratch, making fresh levies on faculty time and effort. Even when successful, the

The challenge for university and college communities is not to supplant the vernacular of the academy with that of the market or vice versa; it is to create a language that recognizes the demands of the market while affirming the values that define higher education institutions.

continuing need to plan and budget for change brought concern that the process could bring a further erosion of the academic freedom that faculty value most.

Administrative and faculty leaders alike stressed the need to preserve the tenets of academic governance while expediting an institution's ability to respond in a timely way to rapidly changing conditions. Many in St. Louis expressed an eagerness, even impatience to get on with the necessary course

of change; they found themselves frustrated to the extent that the governance process at their institutions enables a few recalcitrants to oppose any departure from the status quo. Participants expressed a yearning for a restoration of the intellectual focus and direction they see as characteristic of a truly academic enterprise, and for a clearer sense of overarching purpose to guide institutional decision making. Several observed that while their institutions had grown opportunistically through the 1980s when resources were readily available, these same institutions had imposed across-the-board cuts in times of retrenchment, yielding versions of themselves that no one intended and few really admired.

Market Speak

Most participants in St. Louis—and indeed most of those in higher education—have grown tired of the clatter of "the market." Increasingly, public agencies as well as the public for whom college matters most—parents, students, alumni—have allowed market forces to become the dominant shaper of what was once perceived as a public good. Most institutional leaders, faculty as well as administration, now see themselves as being under assault by a society that expects them to accept "market demands" as their own agenda. The result is that many faculty, whether they like it or not, have been told to justify their practices by a set of criteria and a language that seem to them foreign and even hostile to the values and professional purposes they readily profess.

The degree of comfort with market principles varies among institutions as well as among individual faculty. Within professional schools, community colleges, and some academic disciplines, faculty may find the language of the market largely consistent with their own conception of their work. Some institutions that have brought about real revitalization of their mission and programs have done so by embracing the market. A significant number of individual faculty, however, find it more difficult to respond to market pressures that require their institutions to act in timely and strategic ways: pressures to reduce or realign the budget in response to changing demand and circumstance; pressures to recast the nature of work through the application of technology; pressures to reconceive faculty and staff

It is instructive and not a little frightening to compare the average four-year costs (tuition, fees, room, and board) charged by both private and public baccalaureate institutions with median household incomes over the last two decades.

roles or to incorporate external feedback in the redesign of programs to ensure that students learn and can apply their knowledge.

It may be a comparatively small group of faculty that react so strongly against market language and principles, but their voices take on disproportionate volume in a faculty's collective deliberation. The pressures for reform create fear and mistrust, which can easily galvanize into a labor-management, "we-they" mentality. The sense of antagonism that many faculty develop toward the mentality of market enterprise is often described as a barrier of language: there can be no meaningful exchange between "them" and "us" simply because the terminologies are so different as to preclude communication. Within the perceived semantic barrier is a more fundamental difference that some will readily claim: that higher education's values and purposes are at such odds with those of the marketplace that to champion the former is to deny the latter. Outsiders are quick to belittle academicians' sense of self-interest and hurt pride; many faculty are equally quick to rule out substantive exchange with proponents of the market, whether they be vested in the world outside the academy or in the administration of their own institutions.

The challenge for university and college communities is not to supplant the vernacular of the academy with that of the market or vice versa; it is to create a language that recognizes the demands of the market while affirming the values that define higher education institutions. If the language of market enterprise—with its conceptions of "customers," "restructuring," "continuous improvement," "downsizing"—seems too deterministic, too devoid of the values that inform the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, the language of the academy has come to seem all too self-serving to many of its external constituencies.

What is at issue finally is not just language but analytic perspective. Difference in language is an issue that cuts deeply—one that people take, not just seriously, but personally. Language is both personal and cultural; it is the way people define themselves to themselves. To change language, in a sense, is to deny self. To change analytic perspective, however, is to adopt another way of looking at other things and one's own self. Indeed, the essence of cross-disciplinary research and teaching is the ready employment of a variety of disciplinary perspectives in search of a broader understanding. In this sense, the vernacular of the academy and of the market reflect alternate analytic perspectives—sometimes competing, sometimes working in parallel—that taken together may provide the breadth of outlook needed to plot purposeful courses of change. What follows is an attempt to provide a framework drawn from both perspectives—a vision of the challenges facing higher education institutions that combines the practical reality of the market with the values integral to the pursuit, dissemination, and use of knowledge through successive generations.

A New Reality

The issue of language and perspective becomes all the more important as the market for higher education itself undergoes fundamental changes. Most Americans take as an article of faith that "going to college pays off" in terms of a better job, a better salary, a brighter future; it is what makes equal access to a college and university such an important political goal. It is instructive and not a little frightening, therefore, to compare the average four-year costs (tuition, fees, room, and board) charged by both private and public baccalaureate institutions with median household incomes over the last two decades. The result is essentially a ratio that charts in constant dollars what people earn against what they are being asked to pay either for their own or their children's postsecondary education. As recently as 1975, median household income was nearly 30 percent more than the cost of four years at a private institution and three times more than the cost of four years at a public institution. By 1994 the cost of attending a private institution for four years was twice the median income of American households.

These ratios provide a ready explanation for the increased focus on costs that has come to dominate the public's scrutiny of American higher education. It is not just that cost increases have exceeded the rate of inflation. Rather, what occasions public anxiety is that sense of being asked to pay more for less in terms of likely earnings in relation to stated prices.

For private higher education the crisis of costs is long-standing. The first reaction of most institutions has been to rely on federal student loan funds to help offset the rising cost of attendance. A second, often parallel strategy has been to reduce the stated price of attendance by offering discounts in the form of student financial aid. For the sector of the market most traumatized by this discounting—residential liberal arts colleges—the tuition revenue

The avowal of common values and commitment is the precondition for transformational change within an institution. Having achieved this consensus, substantive steps to change can follow.

actually available to the institution after financial aid has declined from 82 percent in 1976 to 68 percent in 1994—that is, for every one dollar of tuition received, these institutions give back an average of 32 cents in the form of student financial aid. Most believe that such discounting has reached a point of diminishing returns simply because many of these institutions now lack sufficient revenue to invest in the kind of educational experiences the market will continue to demand.

For public higher education the years of greatest challenge lie just ahead—though faculty and administrators in these institutions are quick to point out that they have already weathered substantial budget cuts, often far in excess of their brothers and sisters in private institutions. Given current trends, the costs of a four-year public education will likely exceed median household income this year or next, thus erasing the one-to-three price-to-income ratio of 1975. Absent more fundamental changes, the prospect facing public institutions is a choice be-

tween a further ratcheting up of tuitions or a painful reduction in staffs and facilities.

Getting on with It

If all that the meeting in St. Louis accomplished was a refined set of concepts and language, it would have been just one more roundtable. Return to St. Louis did much more, yielding a distinct sense of what must be done—where to begin, how to proceed, how to judge the results. What became obvious was the need for institutions to define more clearly for themselves a framework within which decisions could be made and actions taken.

Effective change presupposes an institution's ability to come together around a common set of values and educational goals—to rise above individual differences and see itself whole. The achievement of Pew Campus Roundtables has most often been that of helping members of an institution to understand the common ground they share; when they have worked best, Roundtables have produced epiphanies, infusing all participants with a powerful sense of shared direction, shared risks, and shared purposes that unite individuals into the larger whole of the institution. The avowal of common values and commitment is the precondition for transformational change within an institution. Having achieved this consensus, substantive steps to change can follow. The experience of the Pew Campus Roundtables suggests that there are four fundamental steps:

First: Establish a Basis for Trust. A frequently heard lament on college and university campuses is that "no one trusts anyone anymore." The faculty don't trust the administration. Students find faculty distracted and not well attuned to their learning needs. Administrators are wary of both trustees and faculty. Staff see themselves as disenfranchised victims of the administration's need to save money and the faculty's penchant for protecting their own. Frequently schools, departments, and even individual faculty act as if they are each other's targets.

Here no jeremiad will do. Pleas to "trust me!" are most likely to yield only further suspicions that someone is up to something. Rather, administrations and faculty will have to develop mutual trust one step at a time. The place to start, we believe, is

with a series of joint efforts to understand the conditions of the institution. Administration and faculty alike must confront the nitty-gritty questions: "Do we have a structural deficit? Have our students changed more than we have? Are our programs an inchoate jumble?" In these efforts faculty must aspire to a role more constructive than that of "disparity spotter" or "moral cop." Trust is not about investigative forays into administrative bloat or executive salaries or even executive perks. For their part, administrators must take the lead in dealing with cost issues openly and honestly, and they must convey their willingness to work in constructive partnership with faculty. A first step in this direction is to make information available to faculty in a form that can be readily understood. For the faculty, fostering trust means agreeing to be held accountable for their own roles in effecting change.

What we have in mind is a set of simple exercises that can cumulatively yield a sense of shared purpose. A faculty-administrative team might begin by focusing on the condition of the institution itself. The exercise would start with definition, rather than data collection. "What are we trying to accomplish? What problems do we face? What resources do we have to accomplish these ends? What kinds of information do we need and have available to answer these questions? Finally, how much time do we have to reach accord and act on these questions?" One result will be a unique set of performance indicators to which faculty and administrators mutually accede, reflecting the health of the institution and its prospects for the future; these indicators would extend beyond standard input measures of endowment size and average SAT scores to include calibrations of institutional performance in fulfilling its stated goals. A second result, we suspect, will be the recognition that the kinds of records the institution keeps are often not adequate to the task. As this process matures, the questions will necessarily get tougher, focusing more explicitly on investments, trade-offs, and priorities. When these become the topic, however, there will be an agreed-upon and mutually developed set of definitions—and, not so coincidentally, a climate of trust born of the sense that the data are complete and accurately track what they purport to measure.

A second set of exercises involves engaging the campus community in a continuing discussion of

the institution's goals and plans. The development of a working document that seeks to articulate the choices before the institution—what one institution has called a "planning screed," and what might in more modern parlance be considered the product of an on-going electronic bulletin board—can be an effective way of building common understanding

Administration and faculty alike must confront the nitty-gritty questions:
"Do we have a structural deficit?
Have our students changed more
than we have? Are our programs an
inchoate jumble?"

and resolve. A first-draft planning paper, focused on key issues and simultaneously distributed for comment to the campus community, starts the discussion as an invitation to question and think out loud as an institution. As each member of the community adds his or her marks to the document, it becomes a medium for defining terms, for clarifying matters that have created confusion or disagreement, and for building accord for particular courses of action. As with the sharing of budgetary data, engagement in a continuing interactive planning dialogue enables faculty and administration to develop an expectation of behavior that in itself contributes to the development of institutional purpose. A dialogue of this sort can help faculty and administration to work more effectively from a basis of shared understanding and resolve—helping both parties to identify issues, define an appropriate process, and establish a time frame for completing necessary actions.

A third, more advanced set of trust-building exercises is one that takes advantage of an institution's investments in shared language and commitment to forge a collective response to externally mandated change. An example of such institutional citizenship in action is the expedited progress that several institutions have made when required to establish new guidelines for post-tenure review. While the potential for standoff on an issue such as this is always present, the process has created a number of boundary-crossers who embody a perspective that is not based solely in partisan loyalty.

alty to either faculty or administration. Working together on a key policy issue draws faculty and administration into closer proximity and expands the area in which their frames of reference intersect.

Each of the exercises noted above exemplifies the potential for drawing together faculty and administration in a process of collaborative design. In each case, the action taken is a good-faith attempt by faculty and administration to enlarge the perspective and the vocabulary they share.

Second: Link Advocacy and Reform. A surprisingly large number of institutions and consortia now believe that salvation lies principally in better public relations—in telling higher education's story in such a way that critics are silenced and supporters energized. Their first step is accordingly to hire a public relations firm which then sets out to construct that compelling message. Then the problems begin. There aren't crisp answers to the questions the consultants ask. There is waffling—memos filled with phrases like "that is not to say" or "on the other hand"—as nearly everyone tries a hand at crafting a statement that offends no one. Unable to be precise about how their institutions add value to either their students or their communities, campus leaders fall back on tried and true statements about quality and excellence, about the beauty of learning and the dedication of faculty, students, staff, alumni, trustees, neighbors, indeed anyone who comes within earshot of the campus. Presented with these vagaries, there comes the moment when the consultants, exasperated to the point of irreverence, shout, "What's the message? Where's the beef?"

Too often the sad truth is that there is no message. There is a fundamental belief in higher education's special status without the necessary will to define and hence defend the enterprise's separateness. In growing numbers, concerned observers of higher education are coming to perceive an enterprise that, because it lacks collective purpose, is now adrift in a sea of disparate, often conflicting agendas. On the national level, this concern is expressed as the absence of an agenda capable of galvanizing higher education as the response to Sputnik, the Cold War, and the challenges of equal access and civil rights did a generation ago.

Defining and then proclaiming educational purpose requires that administration and faculty rationalize to one another what they do and the human and financial resources they expend doing it. The value of such disclosure is that it subjects individual agendas to the larger framework of institutional goals—a process that necessarily highlights the need for growth in some areas to be paid for by reductions in others. Defining and then proclaiming educational purpose also requires a candid accounting of academic strengths and weaknesses and

Defining and then proclaiming educational purpose requires that administration and faculty rationalize to one another what they do and the human and financial resources they expend doing it.

an analysis of markets to be served. In linguistic terms, what is required is a lexicon that is organic to the institution, rooted in its history, and a set of values, constraints, and strategies that "rule out" as well as "rule in." It is a matter of deciding "what we are and what we are not" that in itself becomes a map for institutional choice and investment. Colleges and universities are fond of defending current practices by pointing out, "We have no bottom line." It is a statement that is more true than they realize in the sense that most institutions have lost sight of what it is they seek to achieve. Too often the "what" is neither money nor a clearly defined set of institutional values.

One of the more intriguing questions asked in St. Louis was, "Why can't the Knight Collaborative make the case for higher education? Why can't there be a real link between advocacy and reform?" The discussion that followed made clear that in this case the issue was not better public relations. What is at stake is higher education's sense of itself—a recognition that colleges and universities need both to advocate and to be advocated.

The reform we seek must be derived from ideas and values and academic truths. It is this sense of purpose through scholarship and the fostering of learning that makes higher education special. Colleges and universities, like all enterprises, need to

husband their resources, learning to disinvest even as they improve their capacity to preserve. Colleges and universities, however, bear an additional obligation—to fulfill their roles as stewards in such a way as to ensure that the environment of learning continues to thrive.

Such stewardship naturally links advocacy and reform. To recast a slogan made popular an election ago, "It's about outcomes, stupid!" Purposeful change ought to result in better student learning, in more inventive research and scholarship. The case for higher education thus becomes one of clearly stated outcomes that reflect both the guiding values and the processes employed to achieve those ends. It is a matter of changing what needs to be altered and preserving, even defiantly, those qualities that foster the enhancement of knowledge and learning.

Achieving such clarity will necessarily be messy. For too long colleges and universities have tried to preserve tranquillity either by not speaking of what troubles and divides them or by escalating any conflict over values into a rhetorical war in which there are only losers. It is time to convene sustaining conversations that combine an understanding of the institution's condition with an ability to see the institution whole. Absent that dialogue, the pressures of the market itself—and not academic values—will determine the shape of institutions, and colleges and universities will be just one more set of enterprises made more efficient through the rigors of competition.

Third: Recast Governance. A recurrent theme from the campus Roundtable institutions, reiterated at the Return to St. Louis meeting, is the difficulty in fostering a genuine commitment to a process of institutional change. In a variety of ways, participants voiced concern that the collegial culture that once informed academic governance at their institutions no longer functions. In its place what has often emerged is a negotiated culture that stresses the interests of particular parties over those of the institution as a whole. "Help us to act" was the refrain of those who bore the scars of failed attempts to bring their institutions to accord on major issues.

Academic self-governance presupposes an institutional community that is committed to the value of conversation as a means of reaching collective

decisions. Through the open exchange of information, ideas, and opinions, the arguments for and against a given proposition come to be embodied in the culture of an institution. A decision reached through this exchange affirms not only the institution's choice among alternatives but the process that led to the decision.

All too often both the ability to act and the deliberative process are compromised by those who decline to participate in the shaping of institutional decisions. Having exerted no hand in the debate or committee work leading to a final vote, nay-sayers emerge in the final hour to oppose a measure with full force and vehemence, often causing months of work to go down in defeat.

Academic governance is a compact not just between faculty and administration but among faculty themselves. The governance process needs to be understood as the means by which faculty come to own their agenda and hold themselves accountable for its completion. Those who reduce the ideal of academic self-governance to "my power of veto" undermine not just the collegial culture of an institution but its credibility with external constituencies. They also compromise an institution's

What most institutions require is a more direct as well as expeditious process for the design, testing, and delivery of new educational programs.

ability to remain viable. If the testimony of our campus roundtables is to be taken seriously, the traditional means for reaching consensus on such matters are just not working. What shared governance has come to do best is ensure against the taking of precipitous actions, of making sure that institutions adhere to the maxim: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." The only good decisions are defined as those that can stand the test of time, for all time. Deliberation becomes a virtue in itself, by default creating a "core value" that most problems will take care of themselves with the passage of time.

What most institutions require is a more direct as well as expeditious process for the design, testing, and delivery of new educational programs. It is

a process that would not allow a pebble on the rail to stop the train of innovation—a process that can move beyond those questions traditionally asked when testing a new proposal: “What’s the problem? Are you sure the problem is not transitory? Can you prove the proposed solution will work, that it’s worth the risk of unintentionally making matters worse rather than better?” In their stead would be a new set of queries: “What’s the opportunity? What are the trade-offs between what we are doing now and what we might be doing? What resources can we shift to meet that opportunity? What are the benchmarks for determining if our initial efforts are worth continuing?”

One possible approach can be found in what a pair of major research universities learned as their roundtables came to focus on the design of new decentralized budgeting procedures: the devil was

It is not a matter of downsizing in the classic corporate mold. Colleges and universities must learn the organic art of pruning, cutting back in order to direct their energies to the most vital and promising limbs.

in the details that could not be mastered. Their solution was to redefine the realms of governance and management. The former became a process for delineating the set of values to govern their new budget systems—and for monitoring the new arrangements in terms of how well they preserved and strengthened those values. The task of management then became the defining of specific processes and procedures for running the budget system and changing the procedures whenever they fail to satisfy the institution’s proclaimed values.

It is this explicit linking of governance, management, and values that makes possible the recasting of how, when, and with what certainty institutions make decisions. This linkage presumes a measure of trust has already been established, through the development of a common outlook capable of making tangible the values and outcomes the institution collectively professes. It assumes that institutions are not shackled in their reform

efforts by intrusive state coordinating boards and government bureaucracy. It builds on the kind of exercises in shared work we believe need to precede the design of alternate ways of making decisions. Most important, that recasting depends on the faculty’s willingness to trust one another—to empower individuals, committees, departments, work groups to “do the right thing” on behalf of the faculty as a whole. Faculty must agree among themselves to abandon the habit of employing rhetorical excess to challenge all who would present a contrary view. The result will be a redefinition of what it means to be collegial and a recognition that to thwart the collective progress of the institution is itself the antithesis of collegiality.

Fourth: Control Costs. Our fourth step is an old friend that is still at the center of the reform agenda. What colleges and universities require now is sufficient capital to invest in their own futures. With little prospect of new manna from any source—public appropriations, dramatically higher tuitions, or unrestricted gifts—what most institutions have available to invest must necessarily come from what they have learned to save.

For a decade now higher education has tried to avoid the inevitable, becoming increasingly testy and impoverished as a result. It is not a matter of downsizing in the classic corporate mold. Colleges and universities must learn the organic art of pruning, cutting back in order to direct their energies to the most vital and promising limbs. In the process they will become simpler, less encumbered by internal bureaucracies, less burdened by the need to fund everyone and everything, more consistently guided by the learning and scholarly outcomes that matter most. The planning goal has to be a leaner—and only if done badly a meaner—institution. Those who leave must be protected, even rewarded, just as those who stay must see themselves as empowered to do more with less by doing it better.

Charting the Steps

In sum, the Knight Collaborative will build on lessons learned in the Pew Roundtables and during Return to St. Louis to work in partnership with institutions to make progress on specific tasks:

- **Establish a basis for trust**—one exercise at a time; administration and faculty have joint responsibility for defining, not just goals and priorities, but the data and related measures of success that will inform the institution of its current status and prospects for the future.
- **Link advocacy and reform**, defining what the institution is about, what it intends to do and not do, and the explicit values from which it expects to make those choices.
- **Recast institutional governance**, making it at once more consistent with the goal of shared purpose and common endeavor; let neither individual nor group, no matter how loud or raucous, subvert the social compact that ought to link faculty and administrators to their institutions and to one another.
- **Get on with the business of controlling costs**; further delays only increase higher education's vulnerability in an era when the power of the market is enhanced wherever there is an absence of conscious choice.

Easy enough to say, though the history of countless institutions attests to the difficulty of accomplishing these things. Each of the four steps outlined above calls on institutions to focus their energies and resources to fulfill a declared purpose. Knowing that one who charts the steps should be able to dance the dance, we have set a focused agenda for the Knight Collaborative over the next two years. This agenda draws from the discussions of the Return to St. Louis meeting and from subsequent conversations with leaders of institutions that make up the Collaborative. Working together, we seek to design, test, and implement alternative academic models for: (1) guiding the enterprise, (2) delivering educational experiences, and (3) managing resources. During its first two years the Knight Collaborative will establish programs and cooperative engagements within each of these categories as follows:

1. Alternative models for guiding the enterprise.

- *Executive Education*: building leadership teams and devising strategies for solving well defined problems.
- *Comparative Indicators for Decision Making*: developing comparative measures to determine the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.

2. Alternative models for delivering educational experiences.

- *Redesign of Learning Spaces*: determining new configurations that accommodate different pedagogies, technologies, and learning needs.
- *Rethinking Time, Credit, Competencies*: implementing alternatives to seat time as the accounting unit of learning.
- *Mediated Learning through Technology*: integrating technology to create new modes of teaching and learning.
- *Educating for Community*: fostering a sense of belonging and mutual responsibility on residential and non-residential campuses.
- *Serving as an Educational Outlet*: sustaining a learning environment in a market of students who "shop" for their education one course at a time.

3. Alternative models for managing resources.

- *Fundraising in a Time of Transformation*: formulating rationales and strategies for fundraising in an era of heightened scrutiny and expectation of institutions.
- *Distributed Budgeting Systems*: fostering responsibility and accountability within individual cost centers.
- *Faculty Incentives—Monetary and Non-Monetary*: sustaining faculty commitment to institutional purpose.

In addition to mounting programs and cooperative engagements in these three areas, the Knight Collaborative will establish a program of institutional cadencing: the periodic visit to a campus by an associate of the Collaborative for the purpose of helping to spur an institution's timely fulfillment of its progress in redesigning the learning experience.

To foster communication and disseminate findings from these programs of focused interaction, the Knight Collaborative will employ a variety of means:

- *Policy Perspectives* will continue to voice lessons learned in the search for best practices in higher education reform, drawing from the experiences of individual campus roundtables as well as the successes of the Knight Collaborative.
- *Campus Roundtables* will continue to serve as an entry point into the Knight Collaborative; we expect to invite upwards of 20 new institutions to join in these activities each year.
- *An Interactive Network* will link Knight Collaborative faculty and senior administrators in an expanding, increasingly practical exchange focusing on institutional change; the network will combine electronic and other means of communication, including regional and special-topic roundtables.

Individually and collectively, these initiatives will move institutions beyond the point of good conversation; the Knight Collaborative will work with institutions to identify common problems—and to determine when and how the collective energies of those institutions might be usefully engaged in charting solutions together. As such, the Collaborative provides an opportunity for individual colleges and universities to pursue their own challenges in the mirror of issues facing higher education institutions nationwide—to execute their own turning points in the good company of others engaged in this dance with change.

The Pew Higher Education Roundtable program is funded in part through the generosity of The Pew Charitable Trusts.

This issue of *Policy Perspectives* marks the beginning of the Knight Collaborative, a program to develop shared approaches and solutions to issues that Pew Roundtable institutions have in common. The Knight Collaborative is funded in part through the generosity of the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

The essay, "Turning Point," is based on conversations of senior leaders and faculty members from 130 Pew Roundtable institutions who attended Return to St. Louis in November 1996. For this issue, the following individuals served as consulting editors:

Mary-Linda Merriam Armacost
The Pew Higher Education Roundtable

Robert Atwell
American Council on Education

D. Kenneth Baker
Harvey Mudd College

Sunil Chand
Cuyahoga Community College

Alice Chandler
State University of New York,
College at New Paltz

Mary Maples Dunn
Radcliffe College

Darryl G. Greer
The New Jersey State College Governing Boards
Association

Katharine H. Hanson
Consortium on Financing Higher Education

A. Richardson Love, Jr.
The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

David J. Morse
University of Pennsylvania

R. Eugene Rice
American Association for Higher Education

Donna Shavlik
American Council on Education

Mark S. Silver
New York University

Susan B. Stine
Educational Consultant

Ursula Wagener
University of Pennsylvania

Ellen Wert
The Pew Charitable Trusts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Signe Wilkinson

Policy Perspectives is a publication of the Pew Higher Education Roundtable and the Knight Collaborative.

Robert Zemsky
Senior Editor

James F. Galbally, Jr.
Contributing Editor

Ann J. Duffield
Director of Communications

Joan S. Girgus
Contributing Editor

Gregory R. Wegner
Managing Editor

William F. Massy
Contributing Editor

Inquiries should be directed to *Policy Perspectives*, Institute for Research on Higher Education, 4200 Pine Street, 5A, Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090, or call the Education Line, 1-800-437-9799. The Roundtable can also be reached by e-mail at: pp-requests@irhe.upenn.edu

Copyright ©1997 by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. All rights reserved.